

Moscow Refuses To 'Play Ball' With Brzezinski

An extraordinary two-page editorial in the Soviet Communist Party paper *Pravda* yesterday announced the Soviet Government's wholesale rejection of U.S. efforts to pretend that the Carter Administration's strategic arms (SALT) proposals are still on the negotiating table. "Some quarters are pretending in vain that the Soviet side has not given a final answer and that it allegedly needs time to study the new American proposals because of their 'drastic character,'" said *Pravda*. On the contrary, the editorial declared, the Carter package "not only lacks any constructive element but in general cannot be the subject of serious discussion. Nor is it intended for such discussion." (*A full analysis of the Pravda statement will appear in next week's EIR.*)

The *Washington Post* today, calling this a "full-blown public assault" on the Carter administration's nuclear arms control offers, reported that it has already "jarred official U.S. attempts to transfer the Moscow-Washington debates to 'discreet' private negotiations." Incredibly, however, administration officials and advisers quoted by the *Washington Post* attempted to minimize the impact of the *Pravda* statement. It's only a "newspaper editorial," said one. "*Pravda* is discussing our proposals in a way, despite the Soviet contention that they do not warrant discussion," said another.

However Soviet diplomats have shown to all but the mentally unhinged that the editorial *is* Soviet policy, and it is final. In a meeting yesterday with national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, Soviet ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin unceremoniously refused to enter into what Brzezinski euphemistically referred to as "the bargaining process." "That they don't find our proposals congenial has already been made clear," Brzezinski told reporters, "and they have not departed from that position."

Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko rejected the Carter Administration's proposals, advanced by Secretary of State Vance in Moscow last month, as "a dubious, not to say cheap" trick to place the Soviet Union at a strategic disadvantage to the U.S. The proposals would have the USSR cutting its strategic weapons arsenal by half while U.S. stockpiles remained virtually untouched, and halting its vital military research and development programs, which some observers say are "20 years ahead of the U.S."

Despite the Soviets' unequivocal response, Brzezinski — targeting the previously compromise-prone Brezhnev faction in the Soviet leadership — still hopes to provoke at least "comment" on the U.S. proposals, thereby resuming bargaining on the terms set by the Carter Administration. Chief U.S. arms negotiator Paul Warnke

flatly announced last week that he did not believe Gromyko really meant what he said! However, Warnke blustered on national television April 10, the U.S. is operating on a "short timetable," and if no breakthrough on SALT is reached by the time Vance and Gromyko confer again in May, the U.S. will have to go ahead with new weapons programs.

The Soviet news agency TASS promptly denounced Warnke for "threats" and "attempted blackmail." The U.S., it said, will have to "assume all responsibility for the consequences of such actions."

The Real Debate

The Warnke-Brzezinski bluff is an even more stupid miscalculation than their original expectation that the Soviets would agree to bargain with Vance in March. The

USLP Pins Arbatov At MIT

When Georgii Arbatov, head of the Soviet USA and Canada Institute, told a Massachusetts Institute of Technology audience April 11 that science and technology increase the danger of nuclear war, the Trilateral Commission backers sponsoring his lecture rushed to defend him from questions by U.S. Labor Party members. Moderator Karl Kaysen — a participant in the recently issued Ford Foundation nuclear energy study advocating deindustrialization and cuts in energy use — banned what he called "political polemics" in the question period and prevented Labor Party speakers from taking the floor.

Labor Party spokesman Graham Lowry, however, collared Arbatov after the speech. "As you know," Lowry said, "the greatest danger today is the threat of thermonuclear war. And this danger is seriously increased by misperceptions among the Soviet leadership of the true state of affairs in the United States. You are a key part of an intelligence operation aimed *against* the Soviet leadership. At one time we thought you were just an incompetent. Now we know you are an incompetent Rockefeller agent." Lowry detailed Arbatov's extensive consultations with David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski.

The MIT lecture series, entitled "World Change and World Security," has featured other leading Atlanticists like McGeorge Bundy and Robert MacNamara.

Politburo decision to override waverings from Brezhnev and reject Vance's package out of hand was not lightly taken and will not be reversed. That issue settled, the faction fight continues on a new footing: what political course to take in the wake of the SALT fiasco.

On the one hand, Carter is provoking the Soviets toward a military hard line, indicating war preparations and a growing conviction in the USSR that a nuclear conflict is likely. On the other, the Soviet faction favoring a political solution to the Carter problem is doing the leg-work for a decisive move into transfer-ruble financing of world trade in the coming months. Deputy Foreign Trade Minister Komarov is in Italy, reportedly to discuss this matter with the Andreotti government.

Intersecting this debate is Rockefeller's inside man in Moscow, Georgii Arbatov, the director of the USA and Canada Institute, who is exerting every effort to disorient the Soviet leadership as to the real situation in the United States, and thereby blunt Moscow's political effectiveness.

Since the collapse of Vance's trip and what the Soviet party daily *Pravda* called Carter's "alarming obstinacy" in sticking to his rejected package, the Soviet press has lambasted Administration tactics in increasingly harsh language. A leading commentator of the government's newsdaily *Izvestia* declared that Soviet-American relations are at "a critical crossroads" and could deteriorate further with consequences for "the entire international situation." The Soviet military daily *Red Star*, repeating a formulation of Defense Minister Ustinov's, vowed that the Soviet economy, science, and technology are now at a level that they can create "in the shortest period of time, any type of weapon that the

enemies of peace would like to place their stakes on."

The precise opposite was trumpeted by Arbatov to a Massachusetts Institute of Technology audience April 11. Arbatov said what he could never say in public in the Soviet Union: "the hazards of too rapid scientific development" have brought the world close to the danger of thermonuclear war.

Speaking on the "question of a new economic order," Arbatov made no mention of the real basis for such an order — a break with the dollar — instead he called for "new international agencies" to "deal with resource problems." This category includes the "Common Fund" proposal for bailing out the New York banks. This resource cartel plan was put forward by the Brookings Institution, a Rockefeller think tank that Arbatov has praised in recent press articles.

Arbatov retailed the line that has become the hallmark of his long-standing efforts to confuse Soviet leaders on the true state of affairs in the U.S.: "vested interests," "the military industrial complex," have created a huge war machine, and it is their thirst for profits that is creating the war danger. The interests to which Arbatov referred are primarily those conservative U.S. industrialists who are a leading source of opposition to the Rockefeller-Carter push for war.

Arbatov is actively engaged in spreading this nonsense throughout the Soviet press. A member of Arbatov's USA and Canada Institute, writing a guest feature in *Red Star* April 10, lied that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff were "pleased" with the Carter proposals. Actually, as the *Washington Post* has reported, the Joint Chiefs opposed the Administration's strategy as too provocative.

Czechs Endorse New Swedish Communist Formation

April 13 (NSIPS) — On March 5 the leadership of the powerful Norskensflamman faction of the Swedish Communist Party, the VPK, announced that it was forming a new party, the Arbetarpartiet Kommunist (APK, Communist Workers' Party). At issue in the break is the VPK's NATO-inspired anti-Sovietism and "zero growth" and anti-nuclear-energy policies, which the APK's preliminary program counters with the demand for rapid development of fission and fusion power. On April 8, the Czechoslovak daily Rude Pravo became the first Eastern European Communist Party paper to endorse the APK. Rude Pravo's article signals that some Eastern European leaders intend to make the APK's principled defection from the agent-ridden Swedish Communist Party an international issue, and use it as leverage against other anti-Soviet "Eurocommunists" still plaguing the Western communist parties.

The Rude Pravo article read in full:

Stockholm, April 7 (CTK) — The main tasks of the new Swedish Arbetarpartiet Kommunist, founded in

March in Sweden, are defense of the vital interests of the Swedish working class, the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress, and the struggle against imperialism. This was stated in the document of the conference of this party, which took place March 26 and 27. The documents also stressed, that the party will consistently adhere to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The formation of this party was the result of the aggravation of differences within Sweden's Left Party-communist (VPK, the Swedish Communist Party — ed.). According to the Swedish press, the leadership of that party took action against certain communists and excluded them from the party. These were people who criticized the policy of the leadership, because it departed from the basic ideological principles of the party. Their views diverged from the leadership's on the principles of proletarian internationalism and the evaluation of the significance of real socialism for international developments.